



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/245,625	02/05/99	BURCH	BUR 025

BRUCE M MONROE
RATNER & PRESTIA
P O BOX 7228
WILMINGTON DE 19803

HM22/0301

WARE, T EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1615	

03/01/01

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/245,625

Examiner

Todd D Ware

Applicant(s)

BURCH ET AL.

Art Unit

1615

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 January 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
- Claim(s) allowed: none.
- Claim(s) objected to: none.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-22 and 25-29.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.
9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
11. ☐ Other:

Continuation of 6. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: while applicants assert that none of the polymers of Hill are elastomeric polymers, the instant specification discloses that nylon (which is disclosed by Hill) is an elastomeric polymer. Indeed, in canceled claim 24, applicants claimed nylon as the intended polymer. Furthermore, Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (10th edition) defines "elastomer" as "any of various elastic substances resembling rubber <polyvinyl ~s>." Nylon is a polyvinyl polymer. Thus the nylon polymer of Hill is the same as the instant invention (claim 1). Applicants also argue that rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103(a) relies upon hindsight. Any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin* 170 USPQ 209. In the instant case, segmented polymer core, elastomeric dental floss is known and incorporation of chemotherapeutic agents into dental floss is known. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to incorporate chemotherapeutic agents into segmented polymer core, elastomeric dental floss with the motivation of imparting chemotherapeutic properties upon the "exceptionally robust elastic" dental floss of Burch.


THURMAN B. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600